

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

* * *

Mariah Maas, as Special Administrator for the Estate of Tiffany Slatsky; Martin Slatsky, as parent and legal guardian of Cade Slatsky, a minor,

Case No. 2:22-cv-00568-GMN-DJA

Order

Plaintiffs,

V.

Christopher Candito, an individual; Andrew Clapper, an individual; Nicholas Robison, an individual; Andrew Stocker, an individual; Steven Honsowetz, an individual; City of North Las Vegas, a municipality; North Las Vegas Fire Department, a City of North Las Vegas agency; GNLV, LLC dba Golden Nugget Hotel & Casino, a domestic limited liability company; Domain Property Owner, LLC, a foreign limited liability company; Oaktree Capital Management, L.P., a foreign limited partnership; et al.,

Defendants.

And related claims.

This action arises out of Tiffany Slatsky's death via drug overdose after she attended a party held by North Las Vegas firefighters and EMTs with her husband—also a firefighter/EMT—Defendant Christopher Candito. Plaintiffs move to amend their complaint to clarify facts, remove certain defendants, add Tiffany Slatsky's father as a plaintiff, and parse out Plaintiffs' constitutional claims. (ECF No. 80). No party has responded to the motion.

Because courts in the Ninth Circuit grant leave to amend with liberality and because no party responded, the Court grants Plaintiffs' motion to amend. Under Rule 15(a)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, “[t]he court should freely give leave [to amend] when justice so requires.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(2). There is a strong public policy in favor of permitting

1 amendment. *Bowles v. Reade*, 198 F.3d 752, 757 (9th Cir. 1999). The Ninth Circuit has made
2 clear that courts should apply Rule 15(a) with “extreme liberality.” *Eminence Capital, LLC v.*
3 *Aspeon, Inc.*, 316 F.3d 1048, 1051 (9th Cir. 2003). Additionally, under Local Rule 7-2(d), the
4 failure of an opposing party to file points and authorities in response to any motion constitutes a
5 consent to the granting of the motion. LR 7-2(d). Considering the strong public policy in favor
6 of permitting amendment, the Ninth Circuit’s caution to apply Rule 15(a) with extreme liberality,
7 and that no party filed a response, granting leave to amend is appropriate here. The Court thus
8 grants Plaintiffs’ motion to amend.

9

10 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Plaintiffs’ motion to amend (ECF No. 80) is
11 **granted**. Plaintiffs shall file and serve their amended complaint as required under Local Rule 15-
12 1.

13

14

DATED: December 29, 2023

15

16


DANIEL J. ALBREGTS
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28